

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were presented for examination and were rejected. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following comments.

The claims as originally filed used the "said" convention for introducing previously-introduced limitations. The claims have been amended to switch to the "the" convention because it is more easily read and comprehended. No substantive change in the scope of the claims is desired or intended by this change.

Claim 18 has been canceled.

The remaining claims have been amended to overcome the prior art cited by the Office. The amendments to independent claims 1, 21 and 27 are taught in paragraphs [0040] -[0073] of the Specification. The amendments to dependent claims 16, 17, and 19 are taught in paragraphs [0074] – [0078] of the Specification. No new matter has been added to any of the amended claims.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claims 1-27

Claim 1-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hitachi ID Systems Inc., Hitach ID Password Manager : Password Synchronization and Reset, "P-Synch Installation and Configuration Guide" (hereinafter "P-Synch") in view of SecurityStats.com, "SecurityStats.com Password Strength Meter" (hereinafter "SecurityStats.com") and further in view of the "One Look Dictionary" search engine (hereinafter "OneLook"). The applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method comprising:
receiving a proposed password from a user;
performing an Internet search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from the proposed password by using a search engine tool;
and
rejecting the proposed password based on the number of web pages retrieved by the search engine tool that contain both the search string and another string that is determined based on a rule for the selection of passwords.
(Emphasis Supplied)

Neither P-Synch nor SecurityStats.com nor OneLook teach or suggest, alone or in combination, what claim 1, as amended, recites — namely, *the rejection of a proposed password based on the number of web pages retrieved by a search engine that contain both the search string and another string that is determined based on a rule for the selection of passwords.*

Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Because claims 2-17, 19, and 20 depend on claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also overcome.

Claim 21, as amended, recites:

21. An apparatus comprising:
a memory; and
at least one processor, coupled to the memory, operative to:
receive a proposed password from a user;
perform an Internet search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from the proposed password by using a search engine tool; and
reject the proposed password based on the number of web pages retrieved by the search engine tool that contain both the search string and another string that is determined based on a rule for the selection of passwords.
(Emphasis Supplied)

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 21 is overcome.

Because claims 22-26 depend on claim 21, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also overcome.

Claim 27, as amended, recites:

27. An article of manufacture for evaluating a password proposed by a user, comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps of:

- receive the proposed password from the user; and
- performing an Internet search using a query containing one or more keywords derived from the proposed password by using a search engine tool; and

rejecting the proposed password based on the number of web pages retrieved by the search engine tool that contain both the search string and another string that is determined based on a rule for the selection of passwords.

(Emphasis Supplied)

For the same reasons as for claims 1 and 21, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 27 is overcome.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Amit Bagga et al.

By /Kiril Dimov/
Kiril Dimov
Reg. No. 60490
732-578-0103 x215

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America